

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace FIG. 3 with the attached Replacement Sheet.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (Fig. 3)

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 26, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

1. Objection to Drawings

Applicant amends Fig. 3 in this Amendment, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are rejected as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, the final clause reciting that two of at least two null time slots occur before and after one data time slot, respectively is alleged to be unclear. Applicant amends the claim to remove the last wherein clause, and thus, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As to claim 2, the “checking the adjusting the bias” is alleged to be unclear. As claim 2 is amended, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Computer-related claims 9-10 are alleged to be indefinite because there is no recitation of steps being performed by the microprocessor. As these claims are amended, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 12-15 are alleged to be indefinite because there is not recitation of parts that make up the (claimed) devices. Claim 12 is amended in this Amendment. However, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-15 correctly recite respective subject matter in a short form which is allowed in the U.S. patent practice. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

3. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9-10 are rejected as the claims are allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant amends claim 9 and cancels claim 10, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 9.

4. Prior Art Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Afrashteh et al. (US 5,426,641; hereinafter “Afrashteh”) in view of Hirvilampi (US 6,351,189).

As noted above, claim 1 is amended by removing the last clause from the claim recitation. Nonetheless, the claimed method is not taught or suggested by the references that do not disclose the operations of detecting deviation and occurrence of null time slots and adjusting a bias of a gate of a transistor of a power amplifier are performed during at least two separate null time slots.

The Examiner asserts that Fig. 3 of Afrashteh shows the aforementioned operations are carried out during two separate null slots. Applicant respectfully disagrees, however.

To begin with, as specified in the Background of the Invention of the specification of the present application, Afrashteh discloses that the operations of measuring, comparing and adjusting the gate voltage are carried out all together within only one null power time slot (page 2, lines 7-10).

Fig. 3 of Afrashteh also does not disclose that the operations of “measure drain, compare and adjust gate voltage” are performed during at least two separate null time slots. Fig. 3 only shows that those operations are performed during each off-period within each frame that is outside the assigned time slot of a burst (see also claim 6, lines 10-11 and col. 15, lines 55-60 of Afrashteh). Here, the off-period does not necessarily indicate at least two separate null time slots. Each pulse period of each frame after a corresponding transmit burst in Fig. 3 does not also appear to cover at least two separate null time slots.

Thus, Afrashteh fails to disclose the aforementioned operations are performed during at least two separate null power time slots.

This deficiency of Afrashteh is not remedied by Hirvilampi. Col. 6, lines 54-56 of this reference also does not clearly disclose the above aspect of the claimed method. Bias adjustment performed only when the amplifier 310 is not transmitting a signal does not teach or suggest that the operations of detecting and adjusting as recited in the claim are performed during at least two separate null power time slots.

Thus, Hirvilampi fails to remedy the deficiency of Afrashteh. Even taken together as a whole, the combined teachings of the two references do not meet the requirements of claim 1.

At least for the foregoing reason, claim 1 and corresponding claims 9 and 11 should be allowable over the references.

Claims 2-8 and 12-15 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements.

5. New Claims

Applicant adds new claims 16 and 17 to more fully cover the present application. The features of the claims are at least based on the 2nd paragraph of the Summary of the Invention and Fig. 2 of the present application.

Hirvilampi (col. 4, lines 25-30) only discloses that one of eight time slots is used for data transmission, but does not disclose the features of the new claims. Entrance and allowance of the new claims are respectfully requested.

6. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Seunghee Park
Registration No. 60,719

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 11, 2008